



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/562,735

05/19/2006

Ofer Mandelboim

2488.033

7654

23405

7590

10/24/2008

HESLIN ROTHENBERG FARLEY & MESITI PC
5 COLUMBIA CIRCLE
ALBANY, NY 12203

EXAMINER

HAMUD, FOZIA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1647

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/562,735	Applicant(s) MANDELBOIM ET AL.	
	Examiner FOZIA M. HAMUD	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/26/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restriction

1a. The preliminary amendment filed on 29 December 2005 has been entered.

Status of Claims:

1b. Claims 1-27 and 34-48 are pending and subject to restriction.

2. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, 20-27 and 47-48, drawn to an isolated peptide fragment comprising NKp46 receptor, a linker peptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- II. Claims 1-3, 12-19 and 20-27, drawn to an isolated peptide fragment comprising NKp44 receptor, a linker peptide, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claims 34-37, drawn to a method for treating a viral disease by administering a peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 12.
- IV. Claims 38-39, drawn to a method for treating a malignant disease by administering a peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 12.
- V. Claims 40-42, drawn to a monoclonal antibody specific for NKp46 peptide and a method of using said antibody, classified in class 530, subclass 388.1.
- VI. Claims 43-46, drawn to a method of using a monoclonal antibody, classified in class 424, subclass 145.1

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, and V are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In the instant case, the peptide fragments of Groups I and II are patentably distinct, because the peptide fragment of Group I comprises NKp46, a polypeptide that comprises 304 amino acid residues that is involved in induction of NK-mediated lysis of human tumor cells, and is also involved in recognition of murine target cells, while the peptide fragment of Group II comprises NKp44, a polypeptide that comprises 278 amino acid residues which is selectively expressed by IL-2– activated NK cells and may contribute to the increased efficiency of activated NK cells to mediate tumor cell lysis.

The peptide fragments of Groups I and II are patentably distinct from the antibody of Group V, for the following reasons: while the inventions of Groups I, II and V are polypeptides, in this instance the peptide fragments of Groups I and II are single chain molecules that have cytotoxic activity, whereas the polypeptide of Group V encompasses antibodies including IgG which comprises 2 heavy and 2 light chains containing constant and variable regions, and including framework regions which act as a scaffold for the complementarity determining regions (CDRs) that function to bind an epitope. Thus the peptide fragments of Groups I and II and the antibody of Group V are

Art Unit: 1647

structurally distinct molecules, any relationship between them is dependent upon the correlation between the scope of the polypeptide fragments that the antibody binds and the scope of the antibodies that would be generated upon immunization with the peptide. Furthermore, searching the inventions of Groups I, II and Group V would impose a serious search burden. The inventions have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications. A polypeptide and an antibody which binds to the polypeptide require different searches. An amino acid sequence search of the full-length protein is necessary for a determination of novelty and unobviousness of the protein. However, such a search is not required to identify the antibodies of Group I. Furthermore, antibodies which bind to an epitope of a polypeptide of Group I may be known even if a polypeptide of Group I is novel. In addition, the technical literature search for the peptide fragments of Groups I, II and the antibody of Group V are not coextensive, e.g., antibodies may be characterized in the technical literature prior to discovery of or sequence of their binding target.

Inventions I, II are related to inventions III, IV as products and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method. The peptide fragments of group I or II as claimed can be used in a method of producing antibodies that bind them.

Invention V is unrelated to invention III, IV. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different

Art Unit: 1647

modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects.

(MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group V is neither used nor produced in the methods of Groups III, IV.

Inventions V is related to invention VI as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different method. The antibody of group V as claimed can be used in a diagnostic method or a method of purifying polypeptide it binds.

Invention I, II are unrelated to invention VI. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects. (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the peptides of Groups I and II are neither used nor produced in the method of Group VI.

Inventions III, IV, and VI are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants. In the instant case, Inventions III, IV, and VI are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with

Art Unit: 1647

materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order

Art Unit: 1647

to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Having shown that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter as defined by MPEP § 808.02, the Examiner has prima facie shown a serious burden of search (see MPEP § 803). Therefore, an initial requirement of restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

Advisory Information:

Art Unit: 1647

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FOZIA M. HAMUD whose telephone number is (571)272-0884. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:00 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Manjunath N. Rao can be reached on (571) 272-0939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fozia Hamud
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1647
17 October 2008

/Bridget E Bunner/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1647